

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicants have canceled claim 14 without disclaimer and amended claims 1, 7 and 15-17 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-13 and 15-26 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 1 has been objected to because of informalities. Claims 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. JP 11-182528 (Shinsuke). Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,789 (Kfoury) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,484 (Vandertouw). Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of Shinsuke. Claims 14, 22, 25 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 14, 22, 25 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the § 112 rejections and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shinsuke. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Shinsuke discloses a hinge device with an opening and closing shaft, a rotary shaft arranged at right angles to the opening and closing shaft, a locking plate fixed to the rotary shaft, flat parts formed on edge parts of the locking plate, rotation regulating cam plates fixed to the opening and closing shaft, the first cam parts which are formed at the rotation regulating cam plates and which can be in contact with the flat parts of the locking plate due to rotation of the opening and closing shaft, and the second cam parts which are formed at the rotation regulating cam plates and which can be in contact with the plate surface from the locking plate when the first cam parts are separated from the flat parts of the locking plate.

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

Regarding claim 15, Applicants submit that Shinsuke does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim. For example, the Examiner asserts that Shinsuke discloses a stopper engagement section, by the disclosure of a first cam part 7 and second cam part 8. However, Shinsuke merely discloses that the first cam part, as noted previously, is in contact with the flat parts of the locking plates due to rotation of the opening and closing shaft, and the second cam part can be in contact with the plate surface of the locking plate when the first cam parts are separated from the flat parts of the locking plate. This is not a stopper engagement section provided at the second end section, and a stopper provided at the first end section, where the stopper allows the second hinge section to freely rotate after the first hinge section has rotated by a predetermined angle around the first hinge shaft, as recited in the claims of the present application. Shinsuke does not disclose or suggest a hinge section being rotated by a predetermined angle around a hinge shaft. Further, Applicants note that claim 15 contains the subject matter from claim 14, deemed allowable by the Examiner.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 15 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Shinsuke does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 15-17 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of Vandertouw. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Applicants submit that these claims have been amended with the subject matter of claim 14 deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited references at least for these reasons.

Regarding claims 2-6 and 8-13, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7, and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-13 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of Shinsuke. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 20, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, a portable terminal that includes a stopper engagement section provided along the second hinge shaft to rotate together with the second hinge shaft, and a stopper

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

configured to restrict movement of the stopper engagement section, wherein the stopper is fixed to the main body section to restrict the second hinge section from freely rotating until the first hinge section rotates by a predetermined angle from the closed position. The Examiner admits that Kfoury does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Shinsuke discloses these limitations as noted previously. However, as noted previously, Shinsuke does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Shinsuke does not disclose or suggest a stopper configured to restrict movement of the stopper engagement section where the stopper is fixed to the main body section to restrict the second hinge section from freely rotating until the first hinge section rotates by a predetermined angle from the closed position. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited references.

Regarding claims 21, 23 and 24, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 20 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-13 and 15-26 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

Serial No. **10/784,793**

Docket No. **IK-0075**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-13 and 15-26 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlgjl

Date: January 12, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-072\111050.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610